REMARKS

Claims 1-36 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office Action dated April 29, 2005, claims 1-36 were rejected.

Applicants herein amend claims 1-4, 8-14, 16-19, 22, 29, 32-36. Claims 1-36 remain pending after this amendment.

Claims 1-36 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0056081 to Morley et al. and the Microsoft Computer Dictionary 4th ed. (1999). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 as amended recites a method for transferring data "*in a multithreaded analytic application executed by a source computer system*" comprising "*concurrently executing a plurality of data transformation threads within the session thread comprising a reader thread... a compressor thread... an encryptor thread... and a writer thread...*".

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by Morely. Morely merely discloses encoding, encryption and compression of audio and video signals. However, Morely does not disclose or suggest concurrently executing a plurality of data transformation threads within the session thread. Morely discloses, "At a central facility or hub, the programming material is digitally compressed, encrypted, and stored to be ready for distribution of that material to large screen displays of the program at one or more auditoriums or theater locations." Par. 19. There is no hint or suggestion in Morely that a plurality of data transformation threads comprising a reader thread, a compressor thread, an encryptor thread, and a writer thread concurrently execute, nor that these threads execute within the session thread. Rather, Morely discloses that the programming material is prepared in advance of any session, which is different in implementation and result from

"*concurrently executing a plurality of data transformation threads within the session thread.*" Parallel execution of the data transformation threads within the session thread, as claimed, enables substantial increase in the speed of the transfer of data. *See, e.g.*, Specification p. 19, ln. 14-20, and p. 24, ln. 18 – p. 25, ln 2.

The deficient disclosure of Morely is not remedied by the disclosure in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary. The Microsoft Computer Dictionary merely defines the function and application of buffers, but does not disclose or suggest how buffers could be used to implement the method of claim 1. Specifically, the portion of the Microsoft Computer Dictionary cited supplies no teaching as to the concurrent execution of a plurality of data transformation threads as recited in the claims.

Thus the deficient disclosure of Morely in combination with the Microsoft Computer Dictionary fails to establish even a prima facie basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. These references do not teach or suggestion all of the limitations of claim 1 as detailed above.

Claim 19 as amended recites "*a source computer system*" comprising a "*multithreaded analytic application*" stored in the memory unit wherein the "*application executes the reader channel object, the compressor channel object, the encryptor channel object, and the writer channel object concurrently.*" The disclosure of Morely in combination with the Microsoft Computer Dictionary similarly fails to disclose the recited channel objects and their functions, nor the concurrent execution of these channel objects. Therefore, claim 19 is also patentably distinct over the cited art.

Claim 11 as amended recites a method for receiving data transferred from a source computer system in a "*multithreaded analytic application executed by a target computer*

system", the method comprising "*concurrently executing a plurality of data transformation threads within the session thread, comprising a reader thread... a decryptor thread... and a decompressor thread...*". Morely discloses merely decoding, decryption, and decompression of audio and video signals. Morely does not disclose a plurality of data transformation threads within the session thread, nor does Morely suggest the recited reader thread, a decryptor thread, or a decompressor thread and their associated functions.

The deficient disclosure of Morely is not remedied by the disclosure in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary. The Microsoft Computer Dictionary merely defines the function and application of buffers, but does not disclose or suggest how buffers could be used to implement the method of claim 11. Specifically, the portion of the Microsoft Computer Dictionary cited supplies no teaching as to the concurrent execution of a plurality of data transformation threads as recited in the claims.

Thus the deficient disclosure of Morely in combination with the Microsoft Computer Dictionary fails to establish even a prima facie basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. These references do not teach or suggestion all of the limitations of claim 11 as detailed above.

Claim 29 recites a target computer system comprising a "*multithreaded analytic application*" stored in the memory unit wherein the "*application executes the reader channel object, the decryptor channel object, and the decompressor channel object concurrently.*" The disclosure of Morely in combination with the Microsoft Computer Dictionary similarly fails to disclose the recited channel objects and their functions, nor the concurrent execution of these channel objects. Therefore, claim 29 is also patentably distinct over the cited art.

Dependent claims 2-10, 12-18, 20-28, and 30-36 variously depend from their respective base claims, which were shown above to be patentable over the cited references. In addition, these claims recite additional limitations that also are not disclosed by the cited references. Thus, claims 2-10, 12-18, 20-28, and 30-36 are patentably distinct over the cited art.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Mohan Sankaran, Volodymyr Butsky, Srihar C. Koritala, and Zhenyu Tang

Date: July 29, 2005 By: _____

Robert R. Sachs, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 42,120
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (415) 875-2410
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: rsachs@fenwick.com